UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,077	01/17/2001	Prasad Krothapalli	90933/0276150	6745

27498 7590 05/25/2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
2475 HANOVER STREET
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1114

EXAMINER	
DUONG, OANH L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/765,077	KROTHAPALLI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Oanh L. Duong	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/21/05.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/21/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that

(A) Prior Art does not anticipate or suggest sending from a server to a device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a first document pointed to by the first pointer.

As to point (**A**), before addressing applicants' arguments, examiner asserts that in technology information about data structure, the definition of "data structure" is "a physical layout of data ", and a data file is an example of data structure as defined by Computer Desktop Encyclopedia (applicants can access to the definition of data structure at http://www.answers.com/data%20structure). In addition, examiner has given a broadest reasonable interpretation of "context identifier" as "any alphanumeric identifier" in view of the specification of the invention (page 10 lines 4-5). Therefore, based upon the definition of "data structure", and "context identifier" as defined above, Ninolas does teaches sending from a server to a device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a first document pointed to by the first pointer (i.e., each web page comprises an HTML file residing or stored on Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) servers ...each web page is identified by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) which specifies the particular HTTP server and path name by which the HTML file associated with the web page can accessed...frame representation 730 is displayed on the small-

sized electronic display device...frame representation is a web page...the frame representation 730 includes a plurality of frame identifiers 731A-731C... Once a geometric frame identifier is selected, the corresponding frame is displayed on the small-sized electronic display device, col. 10 lines 19-40, col. 12 lines 26-49, col. 13 lines 55-57 and col. 14 lines 41-49) .

(**B**) Prior art does not disclose or suggest a method for maintaining at a server frame context for a device.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "a method for maintaining at a server frame context for a device" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1, 11 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nicolas et al. (Nicolas) (US 6,593,944 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Nicolas teaches a method for maintaining at a server frame context for a device (Fig. 7), the method comprising:

generating a first data structure having a first pointer for a first frame and a second pointer for a second frame (col. 2 lines 63-col. 3 line 2);.

associating a first context indicator with the first data structure (col. 3 lines 2-3 and col. 10 lines 28-32)

sending from a server to a device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a first document pointed to by the first pointer (col. 12 lines 32-44 and col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 11, Nicolas teaches the first pointer and the third pointer point to different documents (Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 15, Nicolas teaches a method for maintaining at a server frame context for a device that is unable to display multiple frames, the method comprising:

generating a list including at least one data structure (col. 3 lines 18-24);

wherein each data structure includes at least two pointers and each of the at least two pointers corresponds to a different respective frame (col. 2 lines 63-col. 3 line 2);

wherein each data structure has a corresponding respective context indicator (col. 3 lines 2-3 and col. 10 lines 28-32); and

sending from a server to a device a first context indicator, a first pointer, and a first document pointed to by the first pointer (col. 12 lines 32-44 and col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 20, Nicolas teaches a method for maintaining frame context (Fig. 7), the method comprising:

receiving at a device a context indicator that points to a data structure on a server (col. 12 lines 32-44);

wherein the data structure has at least two pointers each of which corresponds to a different respective frame (col. 12 lines 32-44);and

receiving at the device one of the at least two pointers and a document associated with the one of the at least two pointers (col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 21, Nicolas teaches sending from the device to the server the context indicator and the one of the at least two pointers (col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 22, Nicolas teaches the sending occurs when a user backtracks to the document pointed to by the one of the at least two pointers and makes a request associated with the document (col.14 lines 30-67).

Regarding claim 23, Nicolas teaches sending from the device to the server a request associated with the context indicator and the one of the at least two pointers (col. 14 lines 30-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 2-10, 12-14, 16-19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicolas in view of Ishimine (US 5,764,227).

Regarding claim 2, Nicolas teaches receiving at a server from the device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a request (col. 14 lines 7-14); generating based on the request a second data structure with a third pointer for the first frame and a fourth pointer for the second frame (col. 14 lines 7-62).

Regarding claim 3, Nicolas teaches receiving at a server from the device a request (col. 16 lines 5-10); and generating based on the request a second data structure having a third pointer for the first frame and a fourth pointer for the second frame (col. 14 lines 7-62).

Regarding claim 4, Nicolas does not teach assigning the first context indicator and the first pointer to current context indicator.

Ishimine, in the same field of endeavor, teaches assigning the first context indicator and the first pointer to current context indicator (Fig. 12(a) col. 7 lines 59-61). Ishimine teaches such assigning step allows easy recognition of each individual page/frame of the document (col. 1 line 6-12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the assigning step of Ishimine in the process of maintaining frame/[page context in Nicolas.

Regarding claim 5, Nicolas teaches associating a second context indicator with the second data structure (col. 3 lines 2-3 and col. 10 lines 28-32); and sending to the device the second context indicator, the third pointer, and a second document pointed to by the third pointer (col. 14 line 63-col. 15 line12).

Regarding claims 6 and 8, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches associating a second context indicator with the second data structure (Ishimine, Fig. 12(b)); and assigning the

second context indicator and the third pointer to a current context indicator (Ishimine, Fig. 12(b)).

Regarding claim 7, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches associating a second context indicator with the second data structure (Ishimine, Fig. 3); and sending to the device the context indicator, the pointer, and a document pointed to by the pointer (col. 12 lines 32-44 and col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 9, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches associating a second context indicator (i.e., 2) with the second data structure; and placing the first context indicator (i.e., 1) and the second context indicator into a list (data table memory 6) in the relative order that the first context indicator and the second context indicator were generated (Ishimine, Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 10, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches assigning the first context indicator and the first pointer to a current context indicator; wherein assigning the first context indicator precedes receiving at a server from the device the first context indicator, assigning the second context indicator and the third pointer to the current context indicator; wherein assigning the second context indicator occurs after receiving at a server from the device the first context indicator (Ishimine, col. 7 line 50-col. 8 line 3).

Regarding claim 12, Nicolas teaches the second pointer and the fourth pointer point to different documents (Fig 7).

Regarding claim 13, Nicola-Ishimine teaches associating a second context indicator with the second data structure; placing the first context indicator and the

second context indicator into a list in the relative order that the first context indicator and the second context indicator were generated (Ishimine, Fig. 3).

Regarding claim 14, Nicolas teaches generating a third data structure with a fifth pointer to the first frame and a sixth pointer to the second frame (col. 2 lines 63-col. 3 line 2); associating a third context indicator with the third data structure (col. 3 lines 2-3 and col. 10 lines 28-32); sending the third context indicator, the fifth pointer, and a third document associated with the fifth pointer to the device (col. 12 lines 32-44 and col. 14 lines 30-49); receiving at the server from the device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a request (col. 14 lines 7-14); and generating based on the request a fourth data structure with a seventh pointer for the first frame and an eighth pointer for the second frame (col. 14 lines 7-62).

Regarding claim 16, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches receiving at the server from the device the first context indicator, the first pointer, and a request (Nicolas, col. 14 lines 7-14); generating based on the request a new data structure (Nicolas, col. 14 lines 7-62); associating a new context indicator with the new data structure (Nicolas, col. 3 lines 2-3 and col. 10 lines 28-32); placing the new data structure into the list (Ishimine, Fig. 3); and sending from the server to the device a new context indicator, a new pointer which is associated with the new data structure (Barclay, col. 6 line 48-col. 7 line 3), and a new document pointed to by the new pointer (Nicolas, col. 12 lines 32-44 and col. 14 lines 30-49).

Regarding claim 17, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches assigning the first context indicator and the first pointer to a current context indicator; and wherein the assigning the first

context indicator occurs before receiving at the server from the device the first context indicator (Ishimine, col. 7 lines 59-col. 8 line 3).

Regarding claim 18, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches reassigning the first context indicator and the first pointer to the current context indicator after receiving at the server from the device the first context indicator (Ishimine, col. 4 lines 23-59).

Regarding claim 19, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches wherein generating is also based on the first context indicator and the first pointer (Ishimine, col. 10 lines 39-67).

Regarding claim 24, Nicolas-Ishimine teaches the context indicator, the one of the at least two pointers and the document associated with the one of the at least two pointers (Ishimine, Fig. 3 col. 4 lines 23-36).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Oanh Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 8:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bharat Barot.

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

O.D
May 22, 2005